REMARKS

The final office action mailed February 20, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-27, 29, 32, 34-47 and 49-52 are pending and stand rejected. Claim 48 was previously withdrawn. Applicants herein amend claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14-16, 23, 25-27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 38-40, 47, 50 and 52 and cancel claims 22, 46, 48, 49 and 51.

Concurrently with this amendment, Applicants are submitting a Miscellaneous Statement Concerning Claims of Copending Application (with a copy of the recently allowed claims of copending application 10/608,818) so that the Examiner can determine whether any double-patenting issues are raised.

Applicants amend claim 1 to include the features of claim 22 (which previously depended from claim 1) and 49 (which previously depended from claim 22). Accordingly, claim 1 now recites:

> (b) prior to step (c), validating and storing a returned certificate corresponding to one of the one or more remotely-located devices so as to create a trust relationship with that remotely-located device, wherein said validating and storing includes requiring input of multiple characters from a user of the wireless device...

The office action rejected claim 49 (which previously included the above step) under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on U.S. Pat. No. 6,640,097 (Corrigan et al., hereinafter "Corrigan") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,028,333 (Tuomenoksa et al., hereinafter "Tuomenoksa") and U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0210789 (Farnham et al., hereinafter "Farnham"). Page 18 of the office action correctly noted that a Corrigan/Tuomenoksa combination "is silent on the capability of validating and storing a returned certificate corresponding to one of the one or more remotely-located devices so as to create a trust relationship with that remotely-located device." The office action then relies on Farnham to teach this capability, and further argues that a Corrigan/Tuomenksa/Farnham combination teaches that the validating and storing includes requiring input of multiple characters from a user of the wireless device.

Even if a person of ordinary skill would have had reason to combine teachings from these three references (which Applicants do not concede), the combination would not teach step (b) of

11

claim 1. The office action asserts that Corrigan column 4, lines 2-3, teaches "mobile users inputs [sic] access security codes when requesting service." Unlike step (b), which requires input of characters from a user of the wireless device in order to validate and store a certificate *that corresponds to a remotely-located device*, the cited portion of Corrigan relates to authentication of a mobile user. Even if combining Corrigan, Tuomenksa and Farnham would result in a wireless device that validates and stores a certificate corresponding to some other device, there is nothing in any of these references to suggest that the validation and storage would require character input from the wireless device user.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 3, 8, 10-21, 23, 24 and 50 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable. Claim 25 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 26, 27, 32, 34-45, 47 and 52 depend from claim 25 and are similarly allowable. Applicants' representative has not found a teaching of step (b) in any of the additional references cited in connection with various dependent claims and does not understand the office action to assert such a teaching in any of said additional references.

All rejections having been fully addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: **/H. Wayne Porter/**
H. Wayne Porter
Registration No. 42,084

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
(202) 824-3000

Dated: April 30, 2008